

**Transcript of
May 26, 2004
Public Hearing**

1 CERTIFIED COPY.

2
3 OPEN HOUSE/ PUBLIC HEARING ON THE
4 DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
6 FOR THE PROPOSED CALIFORNIA
7 HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM
8
9
10
11

12 REPORTERS TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS,

13 Taken at 70 West Hedding

14 San Jose, California

15 Commencing at 1:00 p.m.

16 Wednesday, May 26, 2004,

17 Before Lisa Helgoe, CSR 12216
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

1

1	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD PRESENT:	
2		
3	JOSEPH PETRILLO	
4	FRAN FLOREZ	
5	DAVID VALENSTEIN	
6	ROD DIRIDON	
7	MEHDI MORSHED	
8		
9	TESTIMONY BY:	PAGE
10	DON GAGE	8
11	DANIEL MURILLO	10
12	JAMES WEBB	11
13	MAYA ESPARZA	14
14	BERNADETTE ARELLANO	15
15	ALEX KOBAYASHI	18
16	JOE PIRZYNSKI	19
17	PHILIP LIVELY	22
18	JIM BIGELOW	24
19	JIM TUCKER	26
20	VALENTIN LOPEZ	28
21	ANDREW GROSS	32
22	MELISSA HIPPARD	34
23	PHILIP BROWNE	39
24	LEONARD CONLY	40
25	DENNIS PINION	42

1	ROBERT PATRIE	44
2	MONICA SMITH	46
3	RON FISCHER	48
4	MIKE PEGLER	49
5	LOWELL GRATTAN	53
6	MICHAEL KIESLING	56
7	MAYOR PATRICIA MAHAN	59
8	JENNIFER PAEDON	60
9	DAN McNAMARA	62
10	CARL GUARDINO	64
11	DON REYNOLDS	68
12	JOSEPH BELLI	71
13	BARRY BRECKLING	73
14	MICHAEL SANCHEZ	75
15	CHARLES LUCKHARDT	76
16	SAMUEL DOWNS	77
17	BRIAN SCHMIDT	78
18	JOHN WILKINSON	80
19	BETTIVA SETTIFMAN	82
20	GEORGIA STIGALL	83
21	GARRY STODDARD	88
22	REX LINDSAY	90
23	ZACHARY CRIBAR	92
24	RICHARD McDONALD	95
25	MARGARET OKUZUMI	99

1	ALAN MILLER	102
2	DAVID SCHONBRUNN	106
3	YOLANDA REYNOLDS	111
4	FRANK JESSE	114
5	DR. LEE BOESE	115
6	RICHARD MLYNARIK	118
7	TODD KENNEDY	122
8	JACK STURLA	125
9	WILLIAM GARBETT	126
10	SCOTT IRBY	130
11	LAURA STUCHIMSKY	134
12	GERALD MERRILL	136
13	WALTER STRAKOSCH	137
14	KENNETH MACKAY	139
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 MR. PETRILLO: I will call this hearing
2 to order, and we can begin. We have lot of
3 people who have asked to speak today, and so I
4 would like to get this started and moving along
5 as quickly as possible.

6 I want to welcome everyone to the
7 California High-Speed Rail Authority public
8 hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact
9 Report/ Environmental Impact Statement for the
10 proposed California high-speed train system.

11 This afternoon's hearing is one in a
12 series being conducted throughout the state to
13 receive public and agency input on the draft
14 environmental document. Today's hearing is one
15 of two additional hearings we have added to allow
16 both more time and more occasions for the public
17 to comment on the Environmental Impact Report and
18 Environmental Impact Statement.

19 In addition to these two additional
20 theories, we had extended the time for comments
21 through August, again, in order for the public
22 and those who wish to comment on the
23 Environmental Impact Report and Environmental
24 Impact Statement some additional time to analyze
25 a very complex and large document.

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

5

1 Now, in terms of taking testimony, there
2 are a few ground rules that I would hope that we
3 will follow. First, is I will be calling your
4 name one at a time to come up and speak.

5 Probably I will be calling the subsequent speaker
6 at the same time that I call the additional
7 speaker, so that that person can move to
8 the -- to be ready to speak when the first
9 speaker finishes.

10 When you come up, please state your name
11 and affiliation before you make your comments.
12 These comments are being recorded by a court
13 reporter here tonight and will be included in the
14 comments to the Environmental Impact Report and
15 Impact Statement. So please make sure when you
16 give your name and affiliation, you give it
17 clearly so that she can hear it.

18 In order to accommodate all the speakers
19 in this time frame that we have allocated, we
20 will be limiting testimony to three minutes. And
21 I will let you know maybe 30 seconds before the
22 end that your time is running out. So -- but you
23 can also submit written comments, again, any time
24 within this particular period, and we encourage
25 you to do them.

1 I think one of the reasons for -- this
2 public input is not simply to get your feelings
3 about the environmental impact on the record but
4 by law we are required to examine all of these
5 comments and analyze them and respond to them and
6 report back to -- our consultants have to report
7 back to us on both the comments and the response
8 to comments given to us by our consultants.

9 And with that I will begin the hearing
10 unless someone else has anything to say.

11 Rod suggested that I introduce the people
12 up here. We have to my far left David
13 Valenstein, who is our representative from the
14 federal government on the document.

15 As you know or may know, this is a
16 combined document an EIR, which is a state
17 document, and an EIS, which is the federal
18 document.

19 Fran Florez, who is a member of the
20 California High-Speed Rail Authority from the
21 Central Valley.

22 Myself, Joseph Petrillo, the chairman.

23 Mehdi Morshed, the executive director of
24 the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

25 And on my far right is my Rod Diridon,

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

7

1 who many of you have known for long as working on
2 transportation issues in both public and private
3 here in Santa Clara.

4 Now, anything else?

5 First speaker is Supervisor Don Cage.

6 MR. DIRIDON: Mr. Chairman, as the speaker
7 is coming on board, I would like to thank him and
8 the county for allowing us to use these
9 facilities. And I would also like to thank Don
10 since he represents much of the areas in which
11 the studies are occurring for the potential
12 high-speed rail link in the area. Thank you for
13 taking the time and being here and sharing his
14 comments with us.

PH-SJ001

15 DON CAGE: Thank you, Rod and
16 Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much and board
17 members. I would first like to welcome everybody
18 here to the County of Santa Clara. It's nice to
19 have these kind of hearings where my office is
20 upstairs, and I don't have to travel. I know a
21 lot of these folks had to travel a ways.

22 But as Rod said, I'm on the Board of
23 Supervisors of Santa Clara County. My district
24 is District 1, which covers 70 percent of the
25 county; basically everything from Almaden

PH-SJ001-1

1 Expressway, south down to Gilroy, top of Pacheco
2 Pass, top of Mount Madonna, which is the Santa
3 Cruz County line, and all the way to the Alameda
4 County line on the back side of Mount Hamilton.
5 So this project is going to affect my area
6 significantly.

7 I'm also the Chair of the Valley
8 Transportation Authority. As the board has
9 passed the resolution supporting the southern
10 alignment, and that's my purpose for being here.

11 The Board of Supervisors has not yet made
12 the decision on this. It will be coming before
13 the Board probably early August, at which time we
14 will send a resolution or letter to the
15 High-Speed Rail Authority to let you know what
16 our opinion is on this.

17 I'm just thinking the southern alignment
18 is the only alignment that really works. The
19 Altamont Pass area, there's been a lot of talk
20 about that, a lot of studies. It's a lot more
21 expensive, the cost is. You would have to build
22 a bridge and a lot of other things.

23 And having said all that and having said
24 that I strongly urge them to take the southern
25 alignment as the District 1 representative -- and

PH-SJ001-1
cont

PH-SJ001-2

PH-SJ001-3

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

9

1 I'm not representing the Board; this is just from
2 my district -- I would like to see that alignment
3 go through Pacheco Pass and not the back country.

4 From an environmental point of view, it's
5 a pristine area. If you have not been there, you
6 should -- you want to call my office, I'll show
7 you the area. It does not need to be disturbed
8 with a high-speed rail. Wildlife habitat and a
9 lot of endangered species live there.

10 From the Board of Supervisors, we thank
11 you for having this meeting. We will be coming
12 to a decision shortly on that. But VTA wants the
13 southern alignment. And I would like to see it
14 go through Pacheco Pass. Thank you.

15 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you. Daniel Murillo
16 from the office of Santa Clara Supervisor Pete
17 Mettugh.

PH-SJ002

18 DANIEL MURILLO: Good afternoon. My name
19 is Daniel Murillo, and I represent Supervisor
20 Pete Mettugh. Supervisor Mettugh regrets his
21 inability to be here today and wanted me to speak
22 on his behalf.

23 He wanted me to state his strong support
24 for the Pacheco Pass alignment similar to the
25 reasons given by Supervisor Don Cage. He shares

PH-SJ001-3
cont

PH-SJ002-1

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

10

1 many of the same sentiments. He believes that
2 this project is going to achieve the highest
3 success if it directly connects the Bay Area and
4 Los Angeles.

PH-SJ002-1
cont

5 The other routes would not provide that.
6 The Altamont specifically does not provide that.
7 And it would be unfortunate if the alignment was
8 to skip one of the largest cities in the state as
9 well as the largest city in the Bay Area.

PH-SJ002-2

10 The commerce that would happen --
11 interchange of the economic benefits far outweigh
12 the other impacts that may occur with the other
13 alignments.

14 Again, he strongly supports the Pacheco
15 Pass alignment; and hopes he in the future can
16 see his in-laws in a much quicker time. Thank
17 you.

PH-SJ002-3

18 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.
19 Mr. James Webb representing Mayor Gonzalez of the
20 City of San Jose.

PH-SJ003

21 JAMES WEBB: Good afternoon, Members. My
22 name is Jim Webb. I'm senior policy advisor to
23 Mayor Gonzalez. Mayor Gonzalez welcomes you to
24 San Jose and sends his regrets he cannot be here
25 today, but he's attending a conference back east.

PH-SJ003-1

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

11

1 However, he has asked me to comment and
2 say a few words in his behalf. The Mayor and the
3 City Council strongly support the high-speed rail
4 project, and we specifically believe that it's a
5 viable way to add significant capacity to the
6 state transportation, to get people over long
7 distances quickly and safely. There are other
8 benefits you have heard many, many times
9 including supporting the economy.

PH-SJ003-1
cont

10 San Jose supports the EIR recommended
11 southern alignment that will bring high-speed
12 rail to the Bay Area through San Jose. The City
13 has not taken a specific position on either the
14 Diablo or the Pacheco route deferring a way for a
15 more detail study before taking a specific
16 position.

PH-SJ003-2

17 We also know that others believe the
18 Altamont alignment is a better option and should
19 be further studied.

20 We acknowledge there are potential
21 environmental issues with any alignment entering
22 the Bay Area. However, for maximum ridership,
23 fare box recovery, and service efficiency and
24 frequency to the three largest Bay Area cities,
25 we believe must include San Jose from the south

1 and proceed up the peninsula to San Francisco and
2 up the East Bay to Oakland.

PH-SJ002
cont

3 We understand the Authority did not
4 select the Altamont option for further study.
5 The biggest reasons, it reduces services to all
6 three cities and, therefore, ridership and
7 revenues.

8 We believe that any alternative that
9 significantly reduces benefits to the project
10 should be not seriously considered. In addition
11 we do not see a simple easy or cost-effective way
12 to get the service across the bay to serve San
13 Francisco. But these reasons alone, the southern
14 alignment option is superior.

PH-SJ003-3

15 We share the belief that high-speed rail
16 should be used to relieve commuter congestion
17 from the central valley. The rumors to stop to
18 make an effective commuter train would defeat the
19 very purpose of building. Contrary to some
20 beliefs of supporters of the Altamont options,
21 neither San Jose nor the South Bay exert any
22 influence on the EIR recommendation of the
23 southern alignment.

24 However, once the finding was made, we
25 have supported it at every opportunity. We

PH-SJ003-4

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

13

1 believe the recommended southern alignment are
2 the best options for providing service for the
3 Bay Area. We are confident based on the
4 operation and technical goals on constructing a
5 effective state-wide transportation system, the
6 southern gateway should withstand scrutiny as the
7 best alignment alternative.

8 We do not want to see -- we not only want
9 to see the project built. We want to see it
10 built right. Thank you.

11 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. And
12 would you mind giving our thanks to the Mayor for
13 assisting us on some of the budget hearings with
14 the assembly. We appreciate all his help and
15 support.

16 JAMES WEBB: Thank you. I would be happy
17 to do so.

18 MR. PETRILLO: Maya Esparza representing
19 Representative Lofgren and Bernadette Arellano
20 representing Representative Honda.

PH-SJ004

21 MAYA ESPARZA: Hi, I'm Maya Esparza, and
22 this is Bernadette Arellano. Congresswoman Zoe
23 Lofgren and Congressman Mike Honda's office. And
24 they regret they could not be here today. We're
25 also representing Representative Anna Eshoo's

PH-SJ003-4
cont

PH-SJ004-1

1 office. We're going to be reading a joint letter
2 of support signed by all three offices.

3 "Dear Chairman Petrillo, in response to
4 your solicitation for public comment, we would
5 like to express our full support for the
6 California High-Speed Rail Authority's draft
7 program Environmental Impact Review/
8 Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed
9 California high-speed rail train system as it
10 relates to the San Francisco Bay Area.

11 BERNADETTE ARELLANO: We wholeheartedly
12 agree with the Authority's decision after a
13 thorough study of all three options to eliminate
14 the Altamont Pass from further consideration.

15 A southern approach to the San Francisco
16 Bay Area is the only economically and
17 environmentally sound option that meets the
18 stated purpose of this project to provide a
19 predictable and consistent way of intercity
20 travel connecting the state's major metropolitan
21 areas, commercial airports, mass transit systems,
22 and highway networks.

23 A southern approach through the Pacheco
24 Pass or the Diablo Range will effectively serve
25 all three populations and economic centers of the

PH-SJ004-1
cont

PH-SJ004-2

1 Bay Area, while requiring only one split as
2 trains travel through San Jose to Oakland and San
3 Francisco. Minimizing the number of splits
4 should reduce overall travel time attracting a
5 greater number of travelers to the new system.

6 The Altamont Pass in contrast would
7 require to be built a three-way split in Union
8 City to serve Oakland, San Francisco, and San
9 Jose. This split would seriously reduce the
10 number of trains that can serve each of the Bay
11 Area's major metropolitan cities and doubling the
12 operating costs of the system transferring from
13 one with an operating surplus to one with an
14 operating deficit.

15 The draft environmental document,
16 therefore, appropriately concludes that an
17 alignment over the Altamont Pass, quote, would
18 have an adverse impact on the commercial
19 viability of the entire high-speed train system.

20 The environmental implications of an
21 alignment along the Altamont Pass are even more
22 trouble. The Altamont route would require a new
23 crossing over the San Francisco Bay. Not only is
24 this an economically and unlikely alternative; a
25 new bay crossing would impact sensitive wetlands,

PH-SJ004-2
cont

1 saltwater marshes, and aquatic habitat within and
2 surrounding the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay
3 National Wildlife Refuge.

4 The Bay Conservation and Development
5 Commission has discouraged any new or expanded
6 use of bay waters or shoreline habitat important
7 to sensitive bay species.

8 A high-speed rail project that relies on
9 a new bay crossing would likely derail the entire
10 project. The design of the project of this
11 magnitude must be based on state-of-the-art
12 planning and engineering principles that are
13 applicable for a 21st century high-speed
14 passenger train system.

15 We commend California High-Speed Rail
16 Authority for its sophisticated analysis in the
17 alignment options in the San Francisco Bay Area
18 and its ongoing commitment to sound
19 transportation planning.

20 As the Authority finalizes its EIR, we
21 urge the Authority to remain firm in its wise
22 decision to eliminate the Altamont Pass from
23 further consideration as an alternative
24 alignment. Thank you.

25 We also have copies of the letter for any

PH-SJ004-2
cont

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

17

1 members of the public that would like a copy.

2 Thank you.

PH-SJ004-2
cont

3 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much for
4 those comments. The next speaker is Alex
5 Kobayashi from the office of Assembly member
6 Manny Diaz.

7 MR. DIRIDON: While Alex is coming
8 forward, I'd like to share your comments
9 regarding the Mayor also with Manny in assisting
10 us with the assembly budget process recently for
11 the High-Speed Rail Authority. His comments were
12 timely and fitting in making that position.

PH-SJ005

13 ALEX KOBAYASHI: My name is Alex
14 Kobayashi. I'm here on behalf of Manny Diaz.
15 Manny represents a significant portion of San
16 Jose assembly and has worked with all of you on
17 making sure everything is there for high-speed
18 rail.

PH-SJ005-1

19 Manny believes that construction of the
20 first phase of the high-speed between San
21 Francisco and Los Angeles would bring a number of
22 benefits of -- obviously, for the opinions we've
23 heard too often before, and I don't want to go
24 through them again.

25 He just wants to restate his support of

1 the work you've been doing. And as the budget,
2 hopefully, gets finished soon, I would be happy
3 to provide that to the State Assembly. Thank
4 you.

5 AUDIENCE: We still can't hear. We can't
6 hear.

7 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. Can
8 you hear me now? I will ask the speakers to -- I
9 guess they'll have to put their mouth very close
10 to the microphone. Although, we are having the
11 technicians come to see if they can improve the
12 sound system for everyone.

13 The next speaker is Joe Pirzynski,
14 vice-chair of the Valley Transportation Authority
15 and the Los Gatos Town Council.

PH-SJ006

16 JOE PIRZYNSKI: How is this? Good
17 afternoon, Members of the Board. I'm Joe
18 Pirzynski, Los Gatos Town Council Member,
19 vice-chair of the Santa Clara Valley
20 Transportation Authority. I'm also president of
21 the Board of Santa Clara County Cities
22 Association that comprises the mayors and elected
23 representatives of the 15 cities and
24 counties -- 15 cities and towns, rather, of the
25 County of Santa Clara.

PH-SJ005-1
cont

PH-SJ006-1

1 It is as president of the Cities
2 Association that I am here today to express the
3 Board's support for the California high-speed
4 rail system and for the proposed EIR/EIS
5 representation of the southern gateway as the
6 preferred option to access the Bay Area.

7 This alignment for entering in the Bay
8 Area is of utmost importance to Santa Clara
9 County and Silicon Valley. Businesses,
10 employees, and residents are all interested in
11 fast and frequent rail transportation to Southern
12 California. Only the southern gateway alignment
13 appropriately accomplishes these goals.

14 The Cities Association supports the draft
15 program EIR/EIS and the southern alignment in the
16 Bay Area, because this will provide faster and
17 more direct and frequent service to our region's
18 largest urban centers -- San Jose, San Francisco,
19 and Oakland.

20 The High-Speed Rail Authority considered
21 and wisely rejected one other Bay Area alignment
22 through the Altamont Pass. Following this route,
23 trains would split in three lines when entering
24 the Bay Area. One south to San Jose, another
25 north to Oakland, and a third to San Francisco

PH-SJ006-1
cont

PH-SJ006-2

1 over a new bridge across the bay.

2 Splitting the service into three would
3 reduce train frequencies and ridership while
4 substantially increasing operating costs.
5 Additionally, the costs of building a new rail
6 bridge across the bay with its associated
7 developmental hurdles and potential environmental
8 impacts make the Altamont Pass alignment
9 impractical.

10 Therefore, entering the Bay Area through
11 the South Bay would offer higher ridership, more
12 revenue, and less costly to operate than an
13 alignment through the Altamont Pass.

14 One comment I must communicate to the
15 Board, however, from my organization is a
16 recollection of the concerns raised by our
17 membership about the Henry Coe Park option.

18 It is the recommendation of the Cities
19 Association Board that this option not be
20 exercised as the alignment for the southern
21 gateway. The Board regards Henry Coe as too
22 significant and fragile an environment to
23 accommodate the proposed railway.

24 In closing let me commend the efforts and
25 progress of the California High-Speed Rail

PH-SJ006-2
cont

PH-SJ006-3

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

21

1 Authority and thank the Authority Board members
2 for this opportunity to comment.

3 The successful accomplishment of this
4 most significant project will benefit all
5 Californians and again show the country that our
6 state stands as the nation's leader in innovation
7 and technology. Thank you.

8 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. Next
9 speaker is Philip Lively from the Town of
10 Atherton.

PH-SJ007

11 PHILIP LIVELY: Good afternoon,
12 Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. I'm
13 Philip Lively, L-i-v-e-l-y, 24 Hawthorne Avenue,
14 California. I'm the major planning commissioner
15 in the Town of Atherton and retired chief
16 mechanical officer for ESP.

17 I found the public copy in the Palo Alto
18 Public Library. And after a very brief review of
19 this weighty document, I have the following
20 additional comments. These are nonalignment
21 comments.

22 Number 1, please furnish detailed
23 financial analysis to support the statements on
24 revenue and return of investment as stated on
25 Page 2.4. The cost of capital, investment and

PH-SJ006-3
cont

PH-SJ007-1

1 property and equipment lifecycle; maintenance
2 cost of infrastructure tracking all must be
3 included as well as projected fare structure and
4 other sources of revenue.

PH-SJ007-1
cont

5 When Caltrain and BART struggle daily
6 with tax supported financial matters; and Amtrak
7 requires nearly eight-hundred-million dollars in
8 taxes annually to prevent their collapse, how can
9 a high-speed rail system achieve these financial
10 projections as shown in the EIR/EIS documents.

11 Number 2, will a high-speed system be a
12 freight railroad as well as noted on Page 2,
13 dash, 25? First time I heard that one.

PH-SJ007-2

14 Number 3, noise abatement mitigation.
15 First time mentioned in this document on the use
16 of sound abatement walls. Where and in what
17 configuration are walls proposed?

PH-SJ007-3

18 This could be a major environmental
19 consideration in the urban areas; particularly
20 the San Francisco, San Jose corridor where 80 to
21 90 DBAs from a 100 to 125 miles an hour trains
22 are projected reference on Page 3.4.5.

23 Number 4, Table 7.3, dash, 1 is a summary
24 of key environmental impact benefits. This table
25 and the document in total seems to understate the

PH-SJ007-4

1 impacts and overstate the benefits.

2 Please provide detailed justification for
3 this table and its contents. As an example, it
4 totally understates the impact on peninsula
5 corridor communities.

PH-SJ007-4
cont

6 Number 5 and lastly, please note that San
7 Mateo County residents have not been provided
8 with any public location in which to review this
9 document. Thank you.

PH-SJ007-5

10 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. Jim
11 Bigelow, Redwood City and San Mateo County
12 Chamber of Commerce.

PH-SJ008

13 JIM BIGELOW: Good afternoon. Redwood
14 City/San Mateo County Chamber, Jim Bigelow. We
15 have some comments we would like to make.

PH-SJ008-1

16 In reviewing the EIR and EIS documents on
17 the San Francisco Peninsula, we have the Caltrain
18 operation currently that goes -- Redwood City is
19 one of the possible areas for a station. In the
20 document it is very difficult to imagine how big
21 this station would be, the size of the station,
22 the area of the station beyond what the Caltrain
23 station is today.

24 So if this continues to go forward, we
25 would like to get more information on the

1 specifics of stations along the San Francisco
2 Peninsula that would be proposed and really be
3 able to understand more what the land use and the
4 economic impact would be.

PH-SJ008-1
cont

5 From a business perspective, it's
6 important to go from the Bay Area to Los Angeles
7 in the quickest time possible. So on the
8 alignments that are being considered, that should
9 be one of the key factors as well as the economic
10 cost in bringing the project up to an operational
11 level. So the economic requirement and the
12 timeliness of the service and most direct
13 timesaving are very key to business people.

PH-SJ008-2

14 I would also note that we worked 17 years
15 to get the Dumbarton Rail activated with a
16 passage of Regional Measure 2. It is now funded,
17 and it's starting to go forward. With this
18 environmental impact report, it will take two
19 years. There is a lot of problems in the Don
20 Edwards area that we have to deal with with the
21 reactivation of the Dumbarton Rail. It's a
22 sensitive area. It's only one track. I assume
23 in the Altamont case, I understand why that can
24 be a very dicey, challenging alignment.

PH-SJ008-3

25 So our idea is go ahead. We would like

1 to get more information on the impact on the
2 Peninsula. And if you came in on the southerly
3 route, you helped out with the grade separations
4 on the three-county Caltrain operation, that
5 could save a lot of money on helping what already
6 is being done by the Joint Powers Board.

7 So it would appear, based on your
8 document, that the southern alignment, which we
9 have no specific recommendation as far as which
10 one, that's kind of where we're at. So if the
11 economics and everything holds up in your final
12 document, that's where you need to reflect.

13 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. Jim
14 Tucker, the San Jose Silicon Valley Chamber of
15 Commerce.

PH-SJ008-3
cont

PH-SJ009

16 JIM TUCKER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
17 Board, I really do appreciate the opportunity to
18 come before you today. And let me extend along
19 with the Mayor, the welcome of the Chamber to the
20 Silicon Valley. We're delighted you're here and
21 have an opportunity to hear from all of the
22 interest in the Silicon Valley on this important
23 issue.

24 I also want to convey the Chamber's
25 long-time support of the high-speed rail system

PH-SJ009-1

1 in California. And our belief that the draft EIS
2 and EIR is an outstanding document that
3 effectively covers the impacts that will result
4 from construction and operation there of this
5 remarkable rail system.

PH-SJ009-1
cont

6 We also support the document's preferred
7 alignment that will bring high-speed rail through
8 the southern gateway to serve the Bay Area. We
9 agree with EIR and EIS conclusion with the
10 selection of a direct route from the south will
11 offer faster travel time, offer better frequency
12 of service, higher ridership, and revenue. It
13 will be more efficient and less costly to operate
14 and not require a very problematic bay crossing
15 to get to San Francisco.

PH-SJ009-2

16 And because of the points I just sited,
17 we absolutely concur with the High-speed Rail
18 Authority's previous elimination of the Altamont
19 Pass route from consideration.

PH-SJ009-3

20 Mr. Chairman, with your permission, at
21 this point I also want to bring you the greetings
22 from these following organizations -- Deborah
23 Bringelson, president and CEO of Samceda in San
24 Mateo County; and Scott Niece(phonetic) the
25 executive director of the San Jose Downtown

PH-SJ009-4

1 Association. Neither of these folks could be
2 here today, but they will be submitting written
3 comments to the Authority supporting the southern
4 gateway and the high-speed rail system in total.

5 Thank you for considering our
6 perspective, and we are looking forward to the
7 final EIR/ EIS and its ultimate certification.

8 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. We
9 appreciate those comments. Next speaker is Val
10 Lopez followed by Andrew Gross.

PH-SJ010

11 VALENTIN LOPEZ: My name is Val Lopez, and
12 I am the chairperson of the Amah Mutsun Tribal
13 Band; and I would like to thank you for giving
14 our Amah Mutsun Tribal Band the opportunity to
15 speak today regarding the high-speed rail project
16 and it's impact on the traditional tribal lands
17 of influence.

18 From a practical standpoint, we support
19 the high-speed rail project. Our tribal members
20 must drive the roadways every day and realize
21 there is a finite capacity on the existing
22 roadways. With the projected growth in
23 California, the high-speed rail will provide a
24 viable and additional alternative to travel.

25 There are five specific points our tribe

PH-SJ009-4
cont

PH-SJ010-1

1 would like to make today.

2 First of all, I want to tell you that the
3 Amah Mutsun Tribal Band is comprised of
4 documented descendants of Mission San Juan
5 Batista and Mission Santa Cruz. Our current
6 tribal membership requirements allow the Yokuts
7 and other tribes who were taken to these missions
8 to be members of our tribe. Our traditional
9 tribal territories of influence is defined as
10 North Santa Cruz and directly east to
11 approximately Highway 99 and north of Monterey
12 and directly east to, again, approximately
13 Highway 99. We are respectful of Yokuts
14 territory and respect these and all Indian
15 territories as well.

PH-SJ010-1
cont

16 Preference of routes: If the northern
17 route along Interstate 580 is selected, there
18 will be tribal interest from quite a number of
19 tribes. Brushy Peak, this is a territory that
20 your proposal would go into the heart of, and
21 that might be a concern for us.

PH-SJ010-2

22 Let me see. If the southern route is
23 selected, we would prefer the route that runs
24 parallel to the existing 152. This gives the
25 least interruption to a large stretch of Los

PH-SJ010-3

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

29

PH-SJ010-3

1 Banos and north of Tracy. The selection of this
2 road would also better serve Los Banos, Salinas,
3 and Monterey areas. These areas are rapidly
4 growing and will continue to do so.

5 Next, I would like to address the issue
6 of sensitive sites. If the route that parallels
7 152 is selected, our tribe has two sacred sites
8 that potentially lay in the path of the
9 high-speed rail. It is for this reason that we
10 ask that the route has no physical or visual
11 contact with the following:

12 There's a small lake between Gilroy and
13 the 152 Hollister cutoff. I believe this is
14 Highway 25. The lake is marked on the road as
15 Frazier Lake, but is noted on big maps as San
16 Felipe Lake. Our tribe has a sacred site in the
17 vicinity of this area, and we ask that visual and
18 physical contact of the lake be avoided.

19 Our next site is identified in two ways.
20 First, when driving east from Gilroy, we ask
21 visual and physical contact be avoided between
22 county roadside side markers 27.59 and 30.92.

23 This area can also be identified by
24 emergency call boxes. Again, when driving east
25 from Gilroy, we ask you avoid visual and physical

1 contacts between emergency call box numbers 272
2 through 316. This stretch of highway is
3 approximately two miles long.

PH-SJ010-3
cont

4 We appreciate the opportunity to present
5 here today, and we ask that our tribal band be
6 included in all phases of planning and
7 construction. We also ask only member from our
8 tribe be used as monitors in any construction
9 project in our traditional territory of
10 influence.

11 Over 25 of our tribal members have been
12 trained by the Society of California Archeology,
13 which has a community dedicated to training
14 Native American programs and cultural resources.

PH-SJ010-4

15 This training gives our tribe a unique expertise
16 related to laws, rolls and responsibilities,
17 archeology, specific tribal anthropology, and map
18 reading. The Society of California Archeology is
19 also available for consulting with our tribe as
20 needed.

21 Once again, we ask only tribal
22 members -- only Amah Mutsun tribal members be
23 used as monitors and all monitors be trained by
24 the Society of California Archeology.

25 Under no condition do we want monitors to

1 be used whose stated genealogy cannot be verified
2 by PIA documentation. We also ask that any
3 agreement related to tribal monitors be in
4 writing.

PH-SJ010-4
cont

5 Our tribe has been invisible for 150
6 years. Although we were invisible to the public,
7 our tribe remains strong. Today we number over
8 600. It is long overdue that our tribe be
9 recognized by our community and the State of
10 California. It is for this reason that we ask
11 that the route from Los Banos to Gilroy and the
12 Gilroy station be named in honor of our tribe,
13 Amah Mutsun. We would be happy to work with you
14 in any way possible to make this happen. We
15 would be happy to answer any questions you have
16 regarding our tribal interests.

PH-SJ010-5

17 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.
18 Andrew Gross followed by Melissa Hippard.

PH-SJ011

19 ANDREW GROSS: My name is Andrew Gross,
20 and I live in Union City. I'm a strong supporter
21 of the California high-speed rail project. I'm
22 proud of the Authority and all your efforts to
23 make high-speed rail a reality in California. I
24 especially commend your wisdom in rejecting the
25 inefficient Altamont Pass alignment. I note this

PH-SJ011-1

1 meeting is taking place in the capital of Silicon
2 Valley, the largest city in Northern California,
3 soon to be the tenth largest city in the United
4 States.

PH-SJ011-1
cont

5 With the South Bay mountain crossing,
6 every train will stop in San Jose, half
7 continuing up the peninsula to San Francisco and
8 the other half up to Oakland. With an Altamont
9 crossing, only one-third of the trains would
10 serve each city and travel time to Los Angeles
11 would increase by 10 to 26 minutes. A single
12 rail split here in San Jose would best serve the
13 needs and best in the Bay Area and all
14 Californians.

15 I urge the High-Speed Rail Authority to
16 remain steadfast and resist the political
17 pressure to reconsider the Altamont Pass.

18 Regarding the currently proposed
19 alignments and stations, I support two options
20 that will increase overall ridership.

PH-SJ011-2

21 First, between the proposed Pacheco Pass
22 and Diablo routes, I support the Pacheco route
23 with a station in Gilroy rather than Morgan Hill.
24 Of the two cities, Gilroy has a larger
25 population. A station in Gilroy would be 10

PH-SJ011-3

1 miles farther than the San Jose station and have
2 a greater potential to draw riders from the
3 Salinas and Watsonville areas.

PH-SJ011-3
cont

4 In addition the Gilroy station would be
5 convenient for passengers going to Bonfante
6 Gardens, the Gilroy Outlets, and the Garlic
7 Festival.

8 My second suggestion is regarding the
9 intermediary station on the East Bay spur. The
10 mid-point between the population of San Jose and
11 Oakland is Union City. The station there would
12 draw riders from both Hayward and Fremont. More
13 significantly, Union City is currently developing
14 an intramural transit center that will provide a
15 single connection point between high-speed rail
16 and the BART, ACE, and Amtrak systems. Thank
17 you.

PH-SJ011-4

18 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you. Is Mayor Mahan
19 in the audience? Melissa Hippard followed by
20 Philip Brown.

PH-SJ012

21 MELISSA HIPPARD: My name is Melissa
22 Hippard. I'm here representing the Sierra Club,
23 Loma Prieta Chapter.

24 First, I would like to draw your
25 attention to the fact at the January Board

PH-SJ012-1

1 meeting, we brought 1500 actual cards asking the
2 Coe routes would be removed from consideration.
3 Here's an additional 115.

PH-SJ012-1
cont

4 I also have 256 actual cards, if you
5 will, from a variety of our membership asking you
6 to revise and recirculate the current draft
7 "Environmental Impact Report."

PH-SJ012-2

8 Also, last night the City of Mountain
9 View passed a resolution asking the High-Speed
10 Rail Authority to study Altamont. And Monte
11 Sereno and Saratoga have refused to enforce the
12 current EIR. And in the fall of 2003, Morgan
13 Hill passed a resolution also asking you to
14 remove the Coe routes from consideration.

PH-SJ012-3

15 I'm here today to ask you to seriously
16 consider the significant and permanent negative
17 environmental consequences identified in the
18 current draft "Environmental Impact Report."

19 In the process of carefully and
20 thoroughly reviewing the draft "Environmental
21 Impact Report," our team has discovered numerous
22 flaws that lead us to insist that you revise and
23 recirculate the document.

24 According to the California Environmental
25 Quality Act, a project proposal must contain

1 physical alternatives. The omission of Altamont
2 Pass as a feasible alternative to bringing
3 high-speed rail from the Central Valley to the
4 Bay Area is a serious flaw with potential for
5 remedying with legal action.

6 However, rather than seek regress through
7 the court, it would be more cost effective and
8 efficient for all concerned to resolve this
9 matter by improving the environmental analysis
10 with careful attention to meeting the guidelines
11 of CEQA and NEPA.

12 From an environmental perspective the
13 similarities of the environmental impacts
14 proposed through the Diablo Range, especially the
15 northern alignment and the two through Henry Coe
16 Park, we are not provided a reasonable or
17 feasible range of alternatives to choose from.
18 This is what CEQA guarantees us.

19 The impacts of the high-speed rail
20 through the Mount Hamilton area, Coe Park, and
21 numerous wetlands are serious. The entire areas
22 are comprised of intact ecosystems, home to an
23 amazing array of wildlife, including endangered
24 and threatened species.

25 The suggestion of the environmental

PH-SJ012-3
cont

PH-SJ012-4

PH-SJ012-5

1 impact of a new bay crossing makes this
2 alternative a "nonstarter" has no evidence to
3 support it.

PH-SJ012-5

4 At a meeting held on April 8th in the
5 sheriff's office in Sacramento, the Bay
6 Conservation And Development Commission, the
7 Coastal Conservancy, and Save the Bay all
8 indicated they have no objections to a study of
9 this alternative.

10 In addition there may be benefits
11 leveraged for field use in the respiration of the
12 south bay salt ponds.

13 Also there is no need for a three-way
14 split of the trains. Oakland whose connection is
15 planned for after the first phase, can be
16 adequately served through a BART connection, as
17 indicated to you by a letter from Mayor Jerry
18 Brown dated April 20th of this year.

19 As for service, linked trains leaving
20 Southern California can decouple in Fremont,
21 Union City -- wherever the train would come
22 across -- ensuring dedicated train service to San
23 Jose and San Francisco is a possible solution.
24 Running all trains through San Jose makes it
25 unlikely any train would be dedicated to serving

1 this city.

2 Another concern glossed over by the
3 "Environmental Impact Report" is the
4 sprawl-inducing potential of the routes across
5 the Diablo Range. South Santa Clara and San
6 Benito Counties are home to thriving open space
7 and agricultural landscapes that would be forever
8 lost.

9 The Pacheco-Hamilton routes would promote
10 swamp sprawl by opening up transportation
11 patterns where none currently exist. The
12 cumulative impacts from going through the Mount
13 Hamilton area, the Diablo Range, Pacheco Pass are
14 fundamentally important to pay attention to.

15 Please consider that CEQA is not about
16 stopping projects; it's for improving them. The
17 high-speed rail project has great potential for
18 out state. However, as it is currently planned
19 for California, it will not realize the
20 environmental benefits intended through the
21 significant and permanent environmental costs
22 associated with the proposed alignment.

23 I will leave these for you.

24 MR. PETRILLO: Just one question. Isn't
25 there a road that goes through the

PH-SJ012-6

1 Diablo-Hamilton area?

2 MELISSA HIPPARD: Yeah. There's currently
3 a two-lane road there.

4 MR. PETRILLO: Isn't it waiting for --

5 MELISSA HIPPARD: No. Congressman Pombo
6 is interested in seeing it developed, but there's
7 no current project that I'm aware of to do
8 anything with it.

9 High-speed rail, if they get there first,
10 may get less -- more likely put a freeway through
11 there. Again, we are really concerned about
12 cumulative impacts on this area.

13 MR. PETRILLO: Philip Brown followed by
14 Leonard Conly.

PH-SJ013

15 PHILIP BROWNE: Hi, I'm Philip Brown, and
16 I will be very brief. I support the concept and
17 the need for the high-speed rail system in
18 California. However, I think it should be
19 implicated with the least environmental impact
20 possible. Especially I'm opposed to it going
21 through Coe Park.

22 My great-grandfather was Charles B.
23 Wayne(phonetic), who was one of the founders of
24 the state park system. And he believed then a
25 hundred years or so ago -- about a 130 years ago,

PH-SJ013-1

1 I think it was. I'm not sure exactly. Anyway,
2 he believed, as I believe, wilderness should be
3 saved as much as possible. And that's my main
4 point.

PH-SJ013-1
cont

5 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

PH-SJ014

6 Leonard Conly followed by Dennis Pinion.

7 LEONARD CONLY: Hello, my name is Leonard
8 Conly. I live in Berkeley. I support the
9 concept of a high-speed rail system. It makes a
10 lot of sense. I would urge you to extend the
11 public comment period, allowing people more time
12 to digest the complexity of this issue. I can
13 see there are a lot of questions about what's
14 proposed.

PH-SJ014-1

15 I haven't read through the complete EIR.
16 I don't know if you address the question
17 greenhouse gas reduction at all in this EIR and
18 whether it would be appropriate to look at that
19 in terms of which route is going to be the
20 greatest reduction.

PH-SJ014-2

21 I would also, for instance, if we wind up
22 building a route that's going to result in a lot
23 more sprawl in the use of automobiles in the
24 suburban structure you have, that seems like
25 something you should consider.

1 I would also ask you to consult with San
2 Francisco Airport. They have been proposing to
3 build another runway for expanded air traffic.
4 And I've given to you for your records a BBC news
5 report. I'm glad this is not from France. But,
6 nevertheless, it says, "Trains should replace
7 planes. An independent UK advisory group says,
8 ""The contribution of aircraft climate change is
9 deeply worrying."" They estimate 6 to 10 percent
10 of all climate change by the year 2050 will be
11 the result of air travel."

PH-SJ014-2
cont

12 So in view of that, it seems clear
13 getting air traffic -- local air traffic in
14 California on the ground makes a lot of sense. I
15 would encourage you to ask -- to write to the San
16 Francisco Airport authorities and ask them to
17 give you some figures on how much passenger
18 traffic flies between, for instance, just San
19 Francisco and LA or Oakland and LA, I believe
20 it's quite significant; it may be as high as 20
21 percent.

PH-SJ014-3

22 Presumably, by unloading all this air
23 traffic from San Francisco to high -- speed rail,
24 they would be able to eliminate the need to build
25 a runway, which I think would be a great

1 achievement.

2 And I think that's all I have to say at
3 this point. Thank you for your attention.

4 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

5 Dennis Pinion followed by Robert Patrie.

PH-SJ015

6 DENNIS PINION: It's Dennis Pinion. I'm
7 director of Coe Advocates -- or Advocates for
8 Coe.

9 I noticed in this morning's paper there's
10 an article that says, "Environmental group oppose
11 the San Jose line backed by business and
12 political leaders." I want to make it clear, we
13 are in an environmental group, but we are in
14 support of the Pacheco route. The reason why we
15 support the Pacheco route is it's the only route
16 currently under consideration that would not
17 directly or indirectly impact Henry Coe State
18 Park.

19 Also I would like to point out that the
20 part of Henry Coe Park that alignments currently
21 are drawn through also contains a wilderness area
22 officially called Henry Coe Wilderness Area but
23 normally referred to as the Orestimba Wilderness
24 Area.

25 For the wilderness areas established by

PH-SJ014-3
cont

PH-SJ015-1

1 the California State Wilderness Act and pursuant
2 to that ordinance, it is against the law to even
3 use slant oil drilling from outside the park
4 underneath the wilderness area. And so by
5 extension, it seems that even a tunnel under the
6 park would be contrary to the wilderness act.

7 Furthermore, even though a tunnel under
8 the park sounds benign, the EIR just does not
9 contain enough information in it to make a
10 decision on what the impacts really would be.
11 And since this EIR appears to be aware that the
12 decision is going to be made on which alignment
13 is going to be chosen, we want to make clear that
14 we cannot support an alignment under the park
15 even if it was a completely enclosed tunnel. But
16 we want to support the Pacheco Pass. Thank you.

17 MR. DIRIDON: Mr. Chairman, as Dennis
18 walks away, may I put on the record Dennis and
19 his friends took me on a tour of Henry Coe Park a
20 couple of Saturdays ago most of the day. It was
21 not only an enjoyable experience but an
22 eye-opener of the real wilderness back there.
23 They gave me substantial documentation that I
24 have turned over to the staff; and that has to be
25 on the record.

PH-SJ015-1
cont

1 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

2 Mr. Patrie followed by Monica Smith from the
3 office of Assemblywoman Sally Lieber.

PH-SJ016

4 ROBERT PATRIE: My name is Bob Patrie,
5 P-a-t-r-i-e. I live in Scotts Valley,
6 California, and I've been a friend and supporter
7 of the Henry Coe State Park for more than 30
8 years.

PH-SJ016-1

9 The primary purpose of the draft EIR is
10 going to be the discretion of the final corridor
11 in which the high-speed rail system will
12 eventually be built and operated. In addition to
13 listing the route options that would meet the EPS
14 requirements, the EIR should detail the impacts
15 associated with the selection of each of those
16 options so a reasonable choice may be made
17 between them.

18 There are four proposed routes for
19 connecting the Central Valley and San Jose.
20 Three of them pass directly through Coe Park and
21 the 23,000 acre wilderness that Dennis just
22 referred to. And by passing through, I mean
23 nearly 7 miles of passing through. I have some
24 photographs here that indicate a portion of that
25 that I'll leave for you that show before

PH-SJ016-2

1 photographs and an after visualization of what
2 the "minimized tunnel option" would mean. The
3 visualization is based on data provided by
4 Parsons Richter(phonetic), who have an
5 engineering organization.

PH-SJ016-2

6 However, even though the environmental
7 impacts are obviously severe, the EIR contains no
8 meaningful analysis of the impact of the
9 construction in either of these with that of Coe
10 or the state wilderness that it contains. And
11 even more serious, the state wilderness as a
12 whole.

13 Analysis of the impacts have been
14 postponed until a following EIR with only
15 mitigation rather than avoidance would be the
16 only option, and I feel this is unacceptable.

17 These two routes and a third route that
18 passes just north of the park would require a new
19 transportation corridor for more than 35 miles
20 through the rugged Mount Hamilton range, and that
21 area has remained essentially unchanged since the
22 19th century. And I find this to be very
23 disturbing and something to be avoided as all
24 costs.

25 As a result I strongly recommend the

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

45

1 Board consider the selection of the remaining
2 Diablo crossing over the Pacheco Pass as an
3 operation that meets the operational needs of the
4 system by affording the least environmentally
5 damaging practical alternative. This route
6 directly parallels an existing transportation
7 corridor and the experience, gain, and
8 construction of the San Felipe Tunnel and
9 Aqueduct would provide useful engineering and
10 data for the construction of high-speed rail.

11 And nearly 90,000 acres of Coe Park is a
12 unique and valuable resource; not only to the
13 residents of Silicon Valley but for all
14 Californians. The risk to construct high-speed
15 rail I feel is neither acceptable nor necessary.
16 Thank you very much for your time.

17 MR. PETRILLO: Can I suggest everyone turn
18 off their phones. Monica Smith followed by Ron
19 Fischer.

PH-SJ017 20 MONICA SMITH: Hi, my name is Monica
21 Smith. I represent Assemblywoman Sally Lieber,
22 who is pro Tempore of the State Assembly. And
23 I'm glad that was your cell phone and not mine.

24 The Assemblywoman asks me to send her
25 regrets from the assembly floor today she cannot

PH-SJ016-2
cont

PH-SJ017-1

1 be here, and thank you for holding this hearing
2 on this important topic and giving everyone a
3 chance to hear their views on this topic.

4 As you know she is a strong supporter of
5 high-speed rail and has long been a strong
6 supporter of it. She takes great pride in having
7 blocked a bill in the legislature to postpone the
8 bond to 2008.

9 And she supports high-speed rail for all
10 the reasons other speakers brought up today; not
11 least among them, the opportunity to limit the
12 impact of potential airport expansion in the
13 future.

14 Beyond that, in expressing her strong
15 support, there is not much that can be added to
16 what's been said today by the other speakers and
17 the other elected officials and representatives.
18 And she will continue to be a champion for
19 high-speed rail in the State Legislature. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much, and we
22 appreciate the assistance she has given us.

23 MONICA SMITH: I'll convey that to her.

24 MR. PETRILLO: Ron Fischer followed by
25 Mike Pegler.

PH-SJ017-1
cont

PH-SJ018

1 RON FISCHER: My name is Ron Fischer. I'm
2 a resident of Los Gatos and also an advocate for
3 Coe State Park. The state park land has been
4 under increase threat of nonmission use and
5 infrastructure proposals for some time now. This
6 is the first serious threat to the state
7 wilderness system and the State Wilderness Act.

8 State wilderness land is the most
9 protected state land in California today. Any
10 HSR route through Henry Coe, if it were
11 ultimately to be built and go through the
12 wilderness, would destroy the State Wilderness
13 Act through the precedence that would be set by
14 doing so. So I'm here to ask that no impact be
15 done to Henry Coe in this project.

16 Of course, as mentioned before by Dennis,
17 we support the Pacheco Pass route. I
18 have -- several of us have walked the alignment
19 route through the park, and we've taken a long
20 series of pictures, which I can make available to
21 you, which I have on CD, and I've made some
22 prints as well. CDs are available for anyone in
23 the audience outside. Thank you very much.

24 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. Mike
25 Pegler followed by Lowell Grattan.

PH-SJ018-1

PH-SJ019

1 MIKE PEGLER: Ladies and gentlemen, my
2 name is Mike Pegler. I'm a resident and
3 homeowner in the San Jose area. I come before
4 you today as a concerned citizen representing
5 myself and my family. I would like to thank the
6 Commission for the opportunity to speak today and
7 to commend everyone involved in the planning and
8 analysis that's being performed today.

9 In summary, based on reading the summary
10 draft program EIR/EIS for the proposed California
11 high-speed rail system, I'm delighted at the
12 proposal and in favor in proceeding.

13 In California today we enjoy a quality of
14 life second to none. Without drastic action,
15 this will not be the case for very long.

16 High-speed rail can form key components
17 in the safe and rapid transfer of people and
18 time-sensitive goods to enable the economy to
19 grow and flourish and improve our quality of
20 life.

21 With this the 5th largest economy just
22 behind US, Japan, Germany, UK, and France, it's
23 interesting to note, with exception of the US,
24 all the countries larger than us in economic size
25 have a successful high-speed train network.

PH-SJ019-1

PH-SJ019-1
cont

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

49

1 Japan has bullet trains capable of
2 transporting over 100,000 passengers each day.
3 Chief concern over travel is fast, frequent,
4 safe, and reliable service. There have been no
5 passenger fatalities since instituting this
6 service that was introduced in 1964. And on
7 average trains arrive within 24 seconds of
8 schedule.

9 In 1981 running at normal freighting
10 speeds of 186 miles an hour. One set a record of
11 220 miles an hour. Again, the safety record has
12 been almost flawless with no deaths or injuries
13 on high-speed lines and only a few minor
14 derailments. The same cannot be said about
15 California roads.

16 Overall, the high-speed train proposal
17 would reduce traffic congestion, benefit the
18 environment, save energy, and reduce our
19 dependence on oil and decrease the ability for
20 all of us, whether car drivers or not, a
21 significant number of job opportunities for an
22 extended period; many of which cannot be
23 outsourced. Provides a safe and reliable
24 alternative for air travel; provides a sound
25 option for business travelers; and provides a

PH-SJ019-1
cont

1 significant project to running the state around
2 during stiff economic times.

PH-SJ019-1
cont

3 In terms of my specific recommendations,
4 I urge California High-Speed Rail Authority and
5 the Railroad Administration to consider the
6 following points:

7 Learn from other countries where
8 appropriate.

9 Learn proven technologies, such as, those
10 used in Japan and France.

11 Continue with the steel wheel and steel
12 rail approach, and avoid the temptation to head
13 towards more rapid results, such as, maglev.

PH-SJ019-2

14 Consider rolling out the construction
15 operation in phases. Get something running as
16 soon as possible with routes that project high
17 demand and high benefit, integrating existing
18 routes in Phase 1; and then consider upgrading to
19 a more dedicated network in separate tracks in
20 Phase 2. Use initial revenues gained to continue
21 funding the network.

PH-SJ019-3

22 Focus on lower journey times.
23 Particularly for the longer journeys. I believe
24 the French experience found that for every minute
25 of journey time reduced, there would an

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

51

1	additional 100,000 or so riders a year that would	
2	migrate from other types of transportation,	PH-SJ019-3
3	mainly air, to rail.	
4	Do not cross any state parks or wildlife	
5	refugees.	
6	MR. PETRILLO: Excuse me. You are running	
7	up against your three minutes. You need to	
8	conclude.	
9	MIKE PEGLER: I will. Thanks. If I jump	PH-SJ019-4
10	down to specifics. In terms of the northern	
11	mountain crossing, reduce the time between South	
12	Bay and Sacramento; use the northern tunnel	
13	option but avoid encroaching on Henry Coe State	PH-SJ019-5
14	Park. And southern crossing for the I-5 corridor	
15	to make as direct as possible. And the Bay Area	
16	take the more direct I-880 route from San Jose to	PH-SJ019-6
17	Oakland and do not cross the Don Edwards San	
18	Francisco Wildlife Refuge.	
19	In terms of station location, ensure the	
20	minimum major stations are included in that would	
21	include Sacramento, San Francisco, Trans Bay	PH-SJ019-7
22	Terminal, San Francisco Airport, San Jose, Los	
23	Angeles, and San Diego.	
24	Consider dropping Redwood City as a	
25	station due to its proximity to Palo Alto, or	PH-SJ019-8

1 consider using a station from Redwood City to
2 Mountain View. Consider dropping Santa Clara
3 station due to its proximity to San Jose.

PH-SJ019-8

PH-SJ019-9

4 In closing I urge you to proceed with due
5 haste and the related initiative remain on the
6 ballot for this November. This is a long-term
7 project with huge benefit to California. The
8 sooner we can get people to start digging, the
9 better.

PH-SJ019-10

10 I for one look forward to seeing the
11 great State of California fly by at 200 miles per
12 hour while expressway BART leaving most in their
13 cars at 75 miles an hour. Thank you.

14 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. You
15 can leave your written statement. That would be
16 helpful.

17 Lowell Grattan followed by my neighbor,
18 Michael Kiesling.

PH-SJ020

19 LOWELL GRATTAN: Thank you for this
20 opportunity. I'm with the Board of Directors of
21 the American Tree Coalition. And I love these
22 figures: 30 percent profit and 50 million
23 passengers. And I'm amazed we don't have General
24 Motors or Lockheed and Douglas, the giants,
25 wanting to build this profit-making system.

PH-SJ020-1

1 These figures are too good to believe. I don't
2 believe in them, but I can't analyze this as an
3 individual.

4 But I was here a few years ago when we
5 started light rail. And it says, "The light rail
6 vehicle carries four times the number of people
7 as a park bus three times as quickly." Three
8 times as quickly. A bus does 20 miles an hour,
9 and we were told light rail was a 60 mile an hour
10 system. This is Mr. Diridon's words that I'm
11 quoting from the newspaper. It's not a 60 mile
12 an hour system.

13 I was here when we approved BART. "Give
14 us the green light. Put it on the ballot.
15 Traffic relief now."

16 There's no studies that new rail system
17 will reduce auto traffic a diminishable amount.
18 We've been given some bad advice on two programs.
19 This is our Valley Transit plan for 2020. We are
20 now putting 80 percent of our funds into light
21 rail and buses. They provide one percent of the
22 pasture miles. 80 percent of the money goes to
23 one percent. Highways get 15 percent of the
24 funds. And in here it says, "90,000 cars a day
25 will not be able to travel because of road

PH-SJ020-1
cont

1 congestion." That's our plan, and it's screwed
2 up because of light rail. We won't put in
3 tracks.

4 Now, I think we're on the wrong course
5 here. I would love to ride on the train. But we
6 have some experts. I suggest you bring in one of
7 the following experts. He can review your plan
8 very simply for a few dollars. I might even put
9 up half the cost myself. Tom Rubin. He was the
10 accountant on the Los Angeles Transportation
11 Program. He's reviewed 50 plans.

12 Warren Cox travels all over the world
13 analyzing plans. In Washington DC, he testifies
14 before Congress all the time.

15 Randall Tule just completed a study on
16 cities great rail disasters on cities that have
17 transit compared to their living standards. If
18 you spend all your money on light rail and buses
19 and require everybody to live downtown in a
20 polluted area, you are going to have less
21 livability. That should be on your desk. 46
22 pages that list every city in the United States
23 that has rail transit service.

24 So I would like to believe it's true. I
25 would like to invest in the company that owns it,

PH-SJ020-1
cont

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

55

1 but these figures don't make sense. Thank you.

2 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

3 Michael Kiesling and then after that, we will
4 take a five minute for our reporter to rest.

PH-SJ020-1
cont

PH-SJ021

5 MICHAEL KIESLING: Good afternoon.

6 Michael Kiesling. It's too bad we couldn't be
7 doing this about two years ago. If we wouldn't
8 have stopped with Altamont and Pacheco in the EIR
9 and not dropped Altamont and invent the tunnel
10 that was found out to be impossible going from
11 San Jose to the Valley and then replace that with
12 the three routes through Coe, we could have been
13 two years less the study on tunnel in Coe, which
14 will probably be tossed out of this process
15 anyway, and we might have been pushing some dirt
16 around at this point.

PH-SJ021-1

17 I would like the EIR that a lot of these
18 people are reading and coming up from the
19 information from, it doesn't really jive with
20 what happens when you actually do go through and
21 read the details in the EIR or get deeper into
22 the ridership studies.

23 You need to study Altamont. One of the
24 reasons -- I've gone through already at other
25 meetings -- one of them is ridership. In the

1 ridership report, one of the statements that is
2 made is headways and ridership have strong
3 relationship towards one another. Some systems
4 could be up to one to one. When you arbitrarily
5 decide, without reviewing any idea of where
6 people want to go on the trains, to cut the
7 ridership into thirds without regard to the
8 destination on the demand at each end of the
9 branch, you're artificially limiting the
10 ridership. You could be cutting it by two-thirds
11 for every alternative.

12 Your ridership analysis has never looked
13 at the question. And the only way you can come
14 up with this answer is to run the model is to say
15 given this route configuration, and given this
16 demand at each station, which is the best way to
17 provide service? Instead of arbitrarily saying,
18 we're splitting it into three ways even though
19 you know the demand between each of the three
20 destinations is completely different.

21 Second -- so you need to do some more
22 work on ridership.

23 Second visual simulations are nice. One
24 problem with bringing all the trains through the
25 southern gateway through San Jose is you end up

PH-SJ021-1
cont

PH-SJ021-2

1 building a really, really, really big station
2 behind the historic station building at Diridon.

3 I have two simulations I put together.
4 It would be interesting as you go through the
5 document, it's nice to see the visual simulations
6 of what's going on.

7 You have one Gilroy station. It would be
8 good to see one of Diridon Station, because
9 you're building a two-level rail station behind
10 that with the high-speed trains 45 feet up in the
11 air; and the entire building -- just the platform
12 would be the equivalent of a quarter mile long,
13 2.5 million square office building, included with
14 that are all the ramps to meet that building. So
15 I have sections and two little visualizations.
16 You might want to put your engineers to work on
17 that.

18 I think I will leave it at that. You
19 probably won't see me in LA, but you'll get a lot
20 of comments from me in written format. And thank
21 you very much.

PH-SJ022

22 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.
23 Before we take our break, we have Mayor Mahan of
24 the City of Santa Clara to make a few comments.

25 MAYOR PATRICIA MAHAN: Good afternoon.

PH-SJ021-2

PH-SJ022-1

1 I'm Patricia Mahan appearing of behalf of the
2 City of Santa Clara. I'm the mayor of that city.
3 At our last week's meeting, our City Council
4 adopted a resolution that will be submitted in
5 written form, supporting the southern alignment
6 as it would have higher ridership, raise more
7 revenues, be easier and less costly to operate
8 and have a faster travel time for passengers
9 coming through that direction.

10 A southern alignment would have more
11 direct, faster, and frequent service to the three
12 largest cities in the region, i.e., San Jose, San
13 Francisco, and Oakland.

14 And also at our cities association
15 meeting, which I serve as our city's
16 representative, we were concerned with service to
17 our south county. Because in the future BART and
18 other public transportation modalities would
19 bypass that area. So we're very concerned that
20 the high-speed rail be able to serve us -- our
21 southern cities in the southern part of our
22 county.

23 For those reasons as I say, our City
24 Council took official action supporting the
25 southern alignment. And in addition we also

1 wanted to ensure that, of course, all
2 environmental concerns were dealt with with
3 sensitivity, including the issues surrounding
4 traversing Henry Coe State Park.

PH-SJ022-I

5 So as I say, you will be getting a copy
6 of our resolution in written format. And I
7 wanted to add my oral comments to today's public
8 hearing.

9 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. We
10 appreciate your time. After the five minute
11 break, we will begin with Jennifer Paedon
12 followed by Frank Jesse. So we'll take a
13 five-minute break now.

14 (Break taken.)

15 MR. PETRILLO: All right. We are ready to
16 resume the hearing. First one up will be
17 Jennifer Paedon followed by Frank Jesse.

PH-SJ023

18 JENNIFER PAEDON: Good afternoon. My name
19 is Jennifer Paedon, and I represent the Moffett
20 Park Business and Transportation Association.
21 Our member companies comprise of approximately
22 14,000 employees in the Moffett Business Park in
23 Sunnyvale. There has been much discussion
24 regarding whether or not the Altamont Pass route
25 should have been evaluated in the EIR. We would

PH-SJ023-I

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

60

1 like to take this opportunity to voice our
2 support for a southern alignment route versus the
3 Altamont Pass route into the Bay Area and briefly
4 explain our position.

5 First, both the Diablo Pass and Pacheco
6 Pass options allow a two-prong approach through
7 the Bay Area that will help reduce capital and
8 operating costs.

9 Second, as a result of the two-prong
10 approach, all three Bay Area stations will be
11 better served with higher frequency service
12 thereby increasing ridership.

13 Finally, although it would be ideal that
14 there would be no environmental impacts in any of
15 the routes, the fact is all of them being
16 discussed generate environmental impact,
17 including the Altamont Pass route, which requires
18 a new bridge to be constructed across the Bay.

19 In closing we encourage you to move
20 forward and improve the draft EIR as it is
21 presented. Thank you for this opportunity.

22 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. The
23 next speaker is Dan McNamara followed by Carl
24 Guardino.

25 DAN McNAMARA: Good afternoon. I'm Dan

PH-SJ023-1
cont

PH-SJ024

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

61

PH-SJ024-1

1 McNamara from the Train Riders Association of
2 California. First comment I would like to make,
3 it's amazing almost every single person who works
4 in a government who has spoken has mentioned
5 Altamont Pass in one way or another. The idea
6 you didn't do a comprehensive study has a glaring
7 omission when all these people say when the first
8 thing they say is, "Altamont" and where is the
9 comparison?

10 Anyway, our organization has asked you
11 for the last four years to study Altamont. We
12 feel it's critical to make this a complete
13 report, you have Altamont Pass involved in the
14 study.

15 When you to include Altamont, which I
16 think ultimately you will, they should have a
17 section on the benefits Altamont Pass has for San
18 Jose and Silicon Valley. Of the three route
19 options -- Altamont, Diablo, and Pacheco -- only
20 Altamont benefits San Jose and San Jose business.
21 Pacheco and Diablo do not go where the people
22 live who commute into this Valley. Altamont
23 does. 150,000 cars a day come over Altamont Pass
24 going down 580 and 680 into this Valley. Only a
25 few thousand cars come via Los Banos.

PH-SJ024-1
cont

1 High-speed line only has 20 trains an
2 hour in each direction capacity. Your most
3 optimistic studies say you want 4 trains an hour.
4 That means you have room for 16 trains an hour
5 for high-speed commute. All throughout Europe,
6 they use the same line for commute and for
7 high-speed. There's been a couple comments like
8 that; yet it's not true; that's a complete
9 misnomer.

10 Let's say, What is the advantage of San
11 Jose? Some of the ideas here: If you have IBM,
12 and they're looking for a new facility or world
13 headquarters; and you say to them, with our new
14 high-speed line coming through Modesto, Stockton,
15 Sacramento, Pleasanton, Fremont, Manteca, all
16 those towns where people drive now to the Silicon
17 Valley, we can deliver hundreds and thousands of
18 professionals to their door in a downtown
19 business park in San Jose.

20 Does Diablo do this? No. Diablo can't.
21 Diablo is off the table. The same with Pacheco.
22 Pacheco has no people. Your own figure showed
23 500 people total getting on at Los Banos.

24 You're talking about millions of
25 people -- over ten million people, according to

PH-SJ024-1
cont

1 your figure, going via Altamont and you haven't
2 done the comprehensive study on the effects of
3 commuter rail.

PH-SJ024-1
cont

4 So if you're for business and for
5 business in the Santa Clara Valley, the option
6 you should be backing is Altamont Pass. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much. Carl
9 Guardino followed by Don Reynolds.

PH-SJ025

10 CARL GUARDINO: Good afternoon,
11 Mr. Chairman and members. My name is Carl
12 Guardino. I'm president and CEO of the Silicon
13 Valley Manufacturing Group. It is a delight to
14 be here today. I would also mention it is
15 wonderful in regards to the large amount of
16 support of high-speed rail in California. And on
17 that, I hope we can build a common route we can
18 all support when it comes to the voters in
19 November of 2006.

PH-SJ025-1

20 I also want to commend all the work you
21 have done as a commission under the leadership of
22 Manny Morshed, and we compliment your efforts to
23 date.

24 I wanted to provide a quick testimony to
25 you if I may. First, as you know SVMG strongly

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

64

1 supports the concept of a high-speed rail line
2 connecting Southern and Northern California.
3 High-speed rail would delete highway and air
4 traffic between the Bay Area and Los Angeles
5 easing the strain on our airports.

6 It would be two to three times less
7 expensive as well as less polluting and more
8 energy efficient and expanding highways and
9 airports to accommodate a swiftly growing
10 population.

11 SVMG does not have a position on which
12 southern alignment should be used. But we
13 strongly support the conclusion of the draft EIR
14 and EIS that the new rail line use a southern
15 alignment into the Bay Area. Doing so would
16 allow high-speed rail to serve the three largest
17 cities in our region -- San Jose, San Francisco,
18 and Oakland -- while maximizing the speed,
19 frequency, and ridership of the service.

20 It would also enable the system to
21 operate at a surplus, which is a key to future
22 expansion.

23 Additionally, running the trains along
24 the entire Caltrain corridor from Gilroy to San
25 Francisco, will enable Caltrain to achieve

PH-SJ025-1
cont

PH-SJ025-2

1 several of its long-term goals --
2 electrification, grade separation, and increasing
3 the speed and frequency of the commuter trains.
4 All of which will be of enormous benefit to those
5 who live or work in this region.

PH-SJ025-2
cont

6 We believe the Authority's decision to
7 reject the Altamont Pass alignment after thorough
8 consideration was the right decision. For
9 operational reasons alone, this route is not, in
10 our estimation, a viable option. The Altamont
11 Pass would necessitate a three-way split to serve
12 Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose resulting in
13 operational costs twice that of the other options
14 under consideration.

PH-SJ025-3

15 It would also require trains to pass San
16 Jose and then turn south from Modesto to reach
17 Silicon Valley, increasing travel times between
18 San Jose and Southern California by nearly 30
19 minutes.

20 Some have suggested it's simply
21 boosterism that prompts us to argue that all of
22 the high-speed rail lines pass through San Jose
23 on their way to San Francisco or Oakland. On the
24 contrary, it is simply sound transportation
25 policy. It would be sheer folly to choose a

1 route that would increase travel times to Silicon
2 Valley, reducing high-speed rail's
3 competitiveness to this major population and
4 economic center.

PH-SJ025-3

5 On the other hand it does not make sense
6 to route the high-speed trains through the
7 Altamont Pass, as some argue, to provide a
8 transit link between the growing communities of
9 Modesto, Tracy, Stockton, Sacramento, and the Bay
10 Area. We think transit connections between the
11 Central Valley and Bay Area are essential, and
12 that's why we strongly supported and helped lead
13 the effort to create the Altamont commuter
14 express, or ACE Train, and the expanded capital
15 corridor service. But that's not the purpose of
16 high-speed rail.

17 Turning the high-speed line into a
18 commuter line will reduce its ability to provide
19 high-speed long distance transit alternative
20 while undermining the investments we have and
21 continue to make in our regional transit service.

22 Europe has long demonstrated the
23 effectiveness of high-speed passenger rail, and
24 we eagerly anticipate its arrival in Silicon
25 Valley. And we thank you for your leadership to

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

67

PH-SJ025-3
cont

1 make that dream a reality.

2 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much for
3 your comments. Don Reynolds followed by Joseph
4 Belli.

PH-SJ026

5 DON REYNOLDS: I want to thank all you
6 folks for your thorough studies so far in this
7 "Environmental Impact Report" and "Environmental
8 Impact Study."

PH-SJ026-1

9 I guess one of the things that kind of
10 troubles me is when I think about California and
11 its energy use in comparison with the rest of the
12 United States, it's very clear the rest of the
13 United States uses much more energy than anybody
14 else in the world. When we consider California
15 as a country, it comes number two right under the
16 rest of the United States. And the next group of
17 three or four are very poor. So we're a big, big
18 country in that sense, and we're also a very
19 unique country.

20 Let's think of Switzerland as a country
21 that is very prideful of its environmental impact
22 on the quality of life. For years and decades
23 they have stopped their cars at intersections
24 rather than run them and pollute the air. Even
25 up in the mountains where you got a lot of air,

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

68

1 and they don't have a problem with pollution like
2 in California.

3 I think we should take a page from
4 the -- Europe that is much more sophisticated
5 than we are here in trying to rush to develop
6 areas and by political constituents and parochial
7 views of inner cities and how we develop our
8 urban sprawl and made mistakes in Los Angeles.

9 I don't think we can afford to do that
10 with this transportational system. It's a
11 regional system not San Jose system. I think we
12 have to do this right and study it correctly.

13 The report has said something like 13.6
14 billion dollars a year that this thing is going
15 to develop for us. Now, that's a lot of money,
16 13.6 billion. We are talking about 2 million
17 dollars -- only 2 million to restudy the
18 environmental studies and these questions that
19 we've come up with here:

20 Is there really commerce benefits to the
21 routes we've talked about? Are the riderships
22 really clear? Does it really reduce the need for
23 a new rail bridge? Do we have some other ways to
24 do that? What's the cost of a bridge and so on?
25 What about noise abatement that's been brought

PH-SJ026-1
cont

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

69

1 up?

2 I think the EIR overstates the benefits
3 and understates -- these have all been mentioned.
4 Some experts, Don Rodin(phonetic), some other
5 people mentioned here ridership estimates are
6 questionable, visual simulations. We have
7 already heard about these things.

8 I ask the question as a citizen and
9 engineer that we may not have a rush to judgment
10 here. And I don't want to see this thing for
11 our -- leaving this for us and for our children.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you very much.
14 Joseph Belli followed by Barry Breckling.

15 MR. DIRIDON: Mr. Chairman, just so no one
16 jumps to conclusions about quoting the 13 billion
17 dollars a year, that's not in any of our studies.

18 DON REYNOLDS: That may be in a newspaper
19 estimate. I don't know where that came from. We
20 have to check the San Jose Mercury on that.

21 MR. DIRIDON: So please no one quote 13
22 million dollars a year. It would be nice,
23 though.

24 DON REYNOLDS: We can reference that for
25 everybody to look up. Thank you.

PH-SJ026-1
cont

PH-SJ027

1 JOSEPH BELLI: Good afternoon. My name is
2 Joseph Belli. I'm a life-long resident of Santa
3 Clara County and grew up in the foothills of the
4 Diablo Range.

5 From early on I could see that this
6 mountain range is a very special place. One of
7 the few salvaged tracts of wild land left in this
8 region providing home to a wide variety of
9 creatures that have all but disappeared from
10 surrounding areas. I have come to realize that
11 these mountains and the species that inhabit them
12 are unique; a part of our shared natural heritage
13 that absolutely must be preserved.

14 Although, I first heard about the
15 high-speed rail project several years ago, it was
16 not until early this year after reading the draft
17 EIR and alignment options that I became truly
18 concerned about this project. I have spent a lot
19 of time scrutinizing the draft EIR; particularly
20 the biological resources section and find it
21 inadequate in several respects.

22 First and foremost, it suffers from an
23 overall lack of objectivity in assessing the
24 impact of the project. Potential problems are
25 routinely ignored or glossed over. I expect an

PH-SJ027-1

PH-SJ027-2

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

71

1 objective EIR rather than the one that views the
2 project in the best possible light.

3 Also the fact that the EIR contains no
4 onsite analysis is truly appalling. This area
5 deserves to have onsite reconnaissance at all
6 stages of the EIR process. Instead there is an
7 over-reliance on computer-generated data analyses
8 that do not accurately reflect conditions in the
9 ecosystem.

10 Most egregiously there's an incomplete
11 analysis of the effects of the project on habitat
12 fragmentation; one of the greatest threats to
13 biodiversity.

14 The history of our state is chalked full
15 of poorly planned projects that have caused
16 irreversible ecological harm. And here in the
17 21st century, it would behoove us to learn from
18 past mistakes. We have a responsibility not only
19 to preserve our natural heritage by keeping our
20 remaining natural habitat and wild lands as
21 pristine as possible.

22 If this project is to proceed, it must be
23 done the right way and here the choice of route
24 is of paramount importance. I find none of the
25 current alternatives acceptable. The Pacheco

PH-SJ027-2
cont

PH-SJ027-3

BELL & MYERS, CSR, INC.

72

1 Pass crosses vital wetlands and promotes the kind
2 of sprawl that has plagued California for
3 decades.

PH-SJ027-3
cont

4 The route adjacent to Mount Hamilton much
5 of which will destroy critical wildlife habitat
6 and obliterating an area that has changed little
7 since the mission area.

8 And the very thought of running a train
9 through a wilderness area through Henry Coe State
10 Park, the crown jewel of the state park system,
11 is an abomination, a horrendous proposal. There
12 is absolutely no justification for creating
13 another transportation corridor when a suitable
14 one exists along Altamont Pass.

PH-SJ027-4

15 Consequently, I request the Altamont Pass
16 route be reconsidered. Thank you very much for
17 your time.

18 MR. PETRILLO: Thank you. Barry Breckling
19 followed by Michael Sanchez.

PH-SJ028

20 BARRY BRECKLING: My name to Barry
21 Breckling, and I'm a resident of Santa Clara
22 County. Even constructing -- even considering
23 running the high-speed rail through Henry Coe
24 State Park is criminal. It's against the law to
25 damage a state park in any way. The park was

PH-SJ028-1